arXiv:1410.3556v1 [math.CV] 14 Oct 2014

Submanifolds of Hermitian symmetric spaces

Xiaojun Huang*, Yuan Yuan†

Abstract

We study the problem of non-relativity for a complex Euclidean space and a bounded symmetric domain equipped with their canonical metrics. In particular, we answer a question raised by Di Scala.

This paper is dedicated to the memory of Salah Baouendi, a great teacher and a close friend to many of us.

1 Introduction

Holomorphic isometric embeddings have been studied extensively by many authors. In the celebrated paper by Calabi [C], he obtained the global extendability and rigidity of a local holomorphic isometry into a complex space form, among many other important results. In particular, he proved that any complex space form cannot be locally isometrically embedded into another complex space form with a different curvature sign with respect to the canonical Kähler metrics, respectively. In his paper, Calabi introduced the so called diastasis function and reduced the metric tensor equation to the functional identity for the diastasis functions. In a later development [DL1], Di Scala and Loi generalized Calabi's non-embeddability result to the case of Hermitian symmetric spaces of different types.

On the other hand, Umehara [U] studied an interesting question whether two complex space forms can share a common submanifold with the induced metrics. Following Calabi's idea, Umehara proved that two complex space forms with different curvature signs cannot share a common Kähler submanifold. When two complex manifolds share a common Kähler submanifolds with induced metrics, Di Scala and Loi in [DL2] called them to be relatives. Furthermore, Di Scala and Loi proved that a bounded domain with its associated Bergman metric can not be a relative to a Hermitian symmetric space of compact type equipped with the canonical metric. Notice that any irreducible Hermitian symmetric space of compact type can be holomorphically isometrically embedded into a complex project space by the classical

*Supported in part by National Science Foundation grant DMS-1363418

†Supported in part by National Science Foundation grant DMS-1412384

Nakagawa-Takagi embedding. Therefore in order to show that a Kähler manifold is not a relative of a projective manifold with induced metric, it suffices to show that it is not a relative to the complex projective space with the Fubini-Study metric. Meanwhile it follows from the result of Umehara [U], the complex Euclidean space and the irreducible Hermitian symmetric space of compact type cannot be relatives. After these studies, it remains to understand if a complex Euclidean space and a Hermitian symmetric space of noncompact type can be relatives.

Denote the Euclidean metric on $\mathbb{C}^n$ by $\omega_{\mathbb{C}^n}$. For each $1 \leq j \leq J$, let the bounded symmetric domain $\Omega_j \subset \mathbb{C}^{m_j}$ be the Harish-Chandra realization of an irreducible Hermtian symmetric space of noncompact type and let ω_{Ω_j} be the Bergman metric on Ω_j. Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}^\kappa$ be a connected open set and ω_D be a Kähler metric on D, not necessarily complete.

In this short paper, we show that there do not simultaneously exist holomorphic isometric immersions $F : (D, \omega_D) \to (\mathbb{C}^n, \omega_{\mathbb{C}^n})$ and $G = (G_1, \cdots, G_J) : (D, \omega_D) \to (\Omega_1, \mu_1\omega_{\Omega_1}) \times \cdots \times (\Omega_J, \mu_J\omega_{\Omega_J})$ with $\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_J$ positive real numbers. As a consequence, a complex Euclidean space and a bounded symmetric domain cannot be relatives. Indeed, we prove the following slightly stronger result:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a connected open subset. Suppose that $F : D \to \mathbb{C}^n$ and $G = (G_1, \cdots, G_J) : D \to \Omega = \Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_J$ are holomorphic mappings such that*

$$F^*\omega_{\mathbb{C}^n} = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \mu_j G_j^* \omega_{\Omega_j} \quad on \quad D \tag{1}$$

for certain real constants $\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_J$. Then F must be a constant map. Furthermore, if all $\mu_j's$ are positive, then G is also a constant map.

Corollary 1.2. *There does not exist a Kähler manifold (X, ω_X) that can be holomorphic isometrically embedded into the complex Euclidean space $(\mathbb{C}^n, \omega_{\mathbb{C}^n})$ and also into a Hermitian symmetric space of noncompact type (Ω, ω_Ω).*

Acknowledgement: We thank Di Scala for helpful communication related to this work. Indeed, this short paper is motivated by the question raised in his communication, that is answered by Corollary 1.2.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Our proof fundamentally uses ideas developed in our previous work [HY]. Let D be a domain in $\mathbb{C}$. Let $F = (f_1, \cdots, f_n) : D \to \mathbb{C}^n$, $G = (G_1, \cdots, G_J) : D \to \Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_J$ be holomorphic maps satisfying equation (1). Without loss of generality, assume that $0 \in D$ and $F(0) = 0, G(0) = 0$. We argue by contradiction by assuming that F is not constant. By equation (1), we have

$$\partial\bar{\partial}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}|f_i(z)|^2\right)=\sum_{j=1}^{J}\mu_j\partial\bar{\partial}\log K_j(G_j(z),\overline{G_j(z)}) \quad \text{for} \quad z\in D,$$

where $K_j(\xi,\overline{\eta})=\sum_l h_{jl}(\xi)\overline{h_{jl}(\eta)}$ is the Bergman kernel on Ω_j and $\{h_{jl}(\xi)\}$ is an orthonormal basis of L^2 integrable holomorphic functions over Ω_j. Note that Ω_j is a complete circular domain in the Harish-Chandra realization. Therefore, the Bergman kernel of Ω_j satisfies the identity $K_j(e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta}\xi,\overline{e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta}\eta})=K_j(\xi,\overline{\eta})$ for any $\theta\in\mathbb{R}$ and any $\xi,\eta\in\Omega_j$. This implies $K_j(e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta}\xi,0)=K_j(\xi,0)$. Therefore $K_j(\xi,0)$ is a positive constant. In another word, $K_j(\xi,\overline{\eta})$ does not contain any nonconstant pure holomorphic terms in ξ. Similarly, $K_j(\xi,\overline{\eta})$ does not contain any nonconstant pure anti-holomorphic terms in η. Hence $K_j(\xi,\overline{\xi})$ does not contain nonconstant pluriharmonic terms in ξ. After normalization, we can assume tha $K_j(\xi,0)=1$. By the standard argument in [CU], one can get rid of $\partial\bar{\partial}$ to obtain the following functional identity by comparing the pure holomorphic and anti-holomorphic terms in z:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}|f_i(z)|^2=\sum_{j=1}^{J}\mu_j\log K_j(G_j(z),\overline{G_j(z)}) \quad \text{for any } z\in D. \tag{2}$$

After polarization, (2) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}f_i(z)\bar{f}_i(w)=\sum_{j=1}^{J}\mu_j\log K_j(G_j(z),\bar{G}_j(w)) \quad \text{for} \quad (z,w)\in D\times\mathrm{conj}(D), \tag{3}$$

where $\bar{f}_i(w)=\overline{f_i(\overline{w})}$ and $\mathrm{conj}(D)=\{z\in\mathbb{C}|\bar{z}\in D\}$. Notice that the Bergman kernel $K_j(\xi,\eta)$ is a rational function on ξ and η for the bounded symmetric domain Ω_j ([FK]). From this, we have the following algebraicity lemma. Here, we recall that a function H is called a holomorphic Nash algebraic function over $V\subset\mathbb{C}^\kappa$ if H is holomorphic over V and there is a non-zero polynomial $P(\eta,X)$ in (η,X) such that $P(\eta,H(\eta))\equiv 0$ for $\eta\in V$.

Lemma 2.1. *For any $1\le i\le n$, $f_i(z)$ can be written as a holomorphic Nash algebraic function in $G(z)=(G_1(z),\cdots,G_J(z))$, after shrinking D toward the origin if needed.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the algebraicity lemma in Proposition 3.1 of [HY]. Write $D^\delta=\frac{\partial^\delta}{\partial w^\delta}$. Applying the differentiation $\frac{\partial}{\partial w}$ to equation (3), we get for w near 0 the following:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}f_i(z)\frac{\partial}{\partial w}\bar{f}_i(w)=\sum_{j=1}^{J}\mu_j\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial w}K_j(G_j(z),\bar{G}_j(w))}{K_j(G_j(z),\bar{G}_j(w))}. \tag{4}$$

We can rewrite (4) as follows:

$$F(z)\cdot D^1(\bar{F}(w))=\phi_1(w,G_1(z),\cdots,G_J(z)), \tag{5}$$

where $F = (f_1, \cdots, f_n)$, and $\phi_1(w, X_1, \cdots, X_J)$ is Nash algebraic in $(X_1, \cdots, X_J)$ for each fixed w, as the Bergman kernel functions $K_j(\xi, \overline{\eta})$ are rational functions. Now, differentiating (5), we get for any δ the following equation

$$F(z) \cdot D^{\delta}(\bar{F}(w)) = \phi_{\delta}(w, G_1(z), \cdots, G_J(z)). \tag{6}$$

Here for $\delta > 0$, $\phi_{\delta}(w, X_1, \cdots, X_J)$ is Nash algebraic in $X_1, \cdots, X_J$ for any fixed w.

Now, let $\mathcal{L} := \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{D^{\delta}(\bar{F}(w))|_{w=0}\}_{\delta \geq 1}$ be a vector subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Let $\{D^{\delta_j}(\bar{F}(w))|_{w=0}\}_{j=1}^{\tau}$ be a basis for $\mathcal{L}$. Then for a small open disc Δ_0 centered at 0 in $\mathbb{C}$, $\bar{F}(\Delta_0) \subset \mathcal{L}$. Indeed, for any w near 0, we have from the Taylor expansion that

$$\bar{F}(w) = \bar{F}(0) + \sum_{\delta \geq 1} \frac{D^{\delta}(\bar{F})(0)}{\delta!} w^{\delta} = \sum_{\delta \geq 1} \frac{D^{\delta}(\bar{F})(0)}{\delta!} w^{\delta} \in \mathcal{L}.$$

Now, let ν_j $(j = 1 \cdots, n - \tau)$ be a basis of the Euclidean orthogonal complement of $\mathcal{L}$. Then, we have

$$F(z) \cdot \nu_j = 0, \quad \text{for each} \quad j = 1, \cdots, n - \tau. \tag{7}$$

Consider the system consisting of (6) at $w = 0$ (with $\delta = \delta_1, \cdots, \delta_{\tau}$) and (7). The linear coefficient matrix in the left hand side of the system at $w = 0$ with respect to $F(z)$ is

$$\begin{bmatrix} D^{\delta_1}(\bar{F}(w))|_{w=0} \\ \vdots \\ D^{\delta_{\tau}}(\bar{F}(w))|_{w=0} \\ \nu_1 \\ \vdots \\ \nu_{n-\tau} \end{bmatrix}$$

and is obviously invertible. Note that the right hand side of the system of equations consisting of (6) at $w = 0$ (with $\delta = \delta_1, \cdots, \delta_{\tau}$) and is Nash algebraic in $G_1(z), \cdots, G_J(z)$. By Gramer's rule, there exists a Nash algebraic function $\hat{F}(X_1, \cdots, X_J)$ in all variables $X_1, \cdots, X_J$ such that $F(z) = \hat{F}(G_1(z), \cdots, G_J(z))$ near $z = 0$. In fact, in our setting here, we can make $\hat{F}$ holomorphically rational in its variables. □

Let $G = (G_1, \cdots, G_J) = (g_{11}, \cdots, g_{1m_1}, \cdots, g_{J1}, \cdots, g_{Jm_J})$. Let $\mathfrak{R}$ be the field of rational functions in z over D. Consider the field extension

$$\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{R}(g_{11}(z), \cdots, g_{Jm_J}(z)),$$

namely, the smallest subfield of meromorphic function field over D containing rational functions and $g_{11}, \cdots, g_{Jm_J}$. Let l be the transcendence degree of the field extension $\mathfrak{F}/\mathfrak{R}$.

If $l = 0$, then each element in $\{g_{11}(z), \cdots, g_{Jm_J}(z)\}$ is a Nash algebraic function. Hence by Lemma 2.1, each $f_i(z)$ is also Nash algebraic. In this case, we arrive at a contradiction by the following lemma together with Equation (3).

Lemma 2.2. *Let $V \subset \mathbb{C}^\kappa$ be a connected open set. Let $H_1(\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_\kappa), \cdots, H_K(\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_\kappa)$ and $H(\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_\kappa)$ be holomorphic Nash algebraic functions on V. Assume that*

$$\exp^{H(\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_\kappa)} = \prod_{k=1}^{K} (H_k(\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_\kappa))^{\mu_k} \ \ \xi \in V,$$

for certain real numbers $\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_K$. Then $H(\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_\kappa)$ is constant.

Proof. Suppose that H is not constant. After a linear transformation in ξ, if needed, we can assume, without loss of generality, that, $H(\xi)$ is not constant for a certain fixed $\xi_2, \cdots, \xi_\kappa$. Then H is a non-constant Nash-algebraic holomorphic function in ξ_1 for such fixed $\xi_2, \cdots, \xi_\kappa$. Hence, we can assume that $\kappa = 1$ to achieve a contradiction. Write $H = H(\xi)$ and $H_k = H_k(\xi)$ for each $1 \leq k \leq \kappa$. Use $S \subset \mathbb{C}$ to denote the union of branch points, poles and zeros of $H(\xi)$ and $H_k(\xi)$ for each k. Given a $p \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S$ and a real curve in $\mathbb{C} \setminus S$ connecting p and V, by holomorphic continuation, the following equation holds on an open neighborhood of the curve:

$$\exp^{H(\xi)} = \prod_{k=1}^{K} (H_k(\xi))^{\mu_k} . \tag{8}$$

Assume that the minimal polynomial of H is given by $p(\xi, X) = A_d(\xi)X^d + \cdots + A_0(\xi)$ such that $p(\xi, H(\xi)) \equiv 0$. Denote the branches of H by $\{H^{(1)}, \cdots, H^{(d)}\}$ and these branches can be obtained through H by holomorphic continuation. Denote the corresponding branches for H_k obtained by holomorphic continuation by $\{H_k^{(1)}, \cdots, H_k^{(d)}\}$. Let ξ_0 be a zero of $\frac{A_d}{A_0}$ or $\xi_0 = \infty$ if $\frac{A_d}{A_0}$ is a constant. Then some branches of H blow up at ξ_0. Without loss of generality, assume that $\xi_0 = \infty$. Assume that (8) holds in a neighborhood of ∞ after holomorphic continuation from the original equality. By the Puiseux expansion, we can assume that

$$H(\xi) = \sum_{\beta = \beta_0, \beta_0 - 1, \cdots, -\infty} a_\beta \xi^{\beta/N_0} = a_{\beta_0} \xi^{\beta_0/N_0} + o(|\xi|^{\beta_0/N_0})$$

for $|\xi| >> 1$ with $a_{\beta_0} \neq 0$ and $\beta_0, N_0 > 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $a_{\beta_0} > 0$. Now, when $\xi \to \infty$ along the positive x-axis, for the branch $H^{(*)}$, which corresponds to ξ^{β_0/N_0} taking positive value along this ray in its Puiseux expansion, we have $|e^{H^{(*)}(x)}| \geq e^{\left(\frac{a_{\beta_0}}{2} x^{\frac{\beta_0}{N_0}}\right)}$ as $x \to +\infty$. However, the right hand side of (8) grows at most polynomially. This is a contradiction. □

Now, assume that $l > 0$. By re-ordering the lower index, let $\mathcal{G} = \{g_1(z), \cdots, g_l(z)\}$ be the maximal algebraic independent subset in $\mathfrak{F}$. It follows that the transcendence degree of $\mathfrak{F}/\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{G})$ is 0. Then there exists a small connected open subset U with $0 \in \overline{U}$ such that for each j_α with $g_{j_\alpha} \notin \mathcal{G}$, we have a holomorphic Nash algebraic function $\hat{g}_{j_\alpha}(z, X_1, \cdots, X_l)$

in the neighborhood $\hat{U}$ of $\{(z, g_1(z), \cdots, g_l(z)) | z \in U\}$ in $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^l$ such that it holds that $g_{j_\alpha}(z) = \hat{g}_{j\alpha}(z, g_1(z), \cdots, g_l(z))$ for any $z \in U$. Then by Lemma 2.1, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, there exists a holomorphic Nash algebraic function $\hat{f}_i(z, X_1, \cdots, X_l)$ in $\hat{U}$ such that $f_i(z) = \hat{f}_i(z, g_1(z), \cdots, g_l(z))$ for $z \in U$. Define

$$\Psi(z, X, w) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{f}_i(z, X) \bar{f}_i(w) - \sum_{j=1}^{J} \mu_j \log K_j(\cdots, X_\gamma, \cdots, \hat{g}_{j\alpha}(z, X), \cdots, \bar{g}_{j1}(w), \cdots, \bar{g}_{jm_j}(w))$$

and

$$\Phi(z, X, w) = \frac{\partial}{\partial w} \Psi(z, X, w)$$

for $(z, X, w) \in \hat{U} \times \text{conj}(U)$, where $X = (X_1, \cdots, X_l)$.

Lemma 2.3. *For any w near 0 and any $(z, X) \in \hat{U}$, $\Phi(z, X, w) \equiv 0$. As a consequence, $\Psi(z, X, w) \equiv 0$.*

Proof. Assume $\Phi(z, X, w) \not\equiv 0$. Then there exists w_0 near 0, such that $\Phi(z, X, w_0) \not\equiv 0$. Since $\Phi(z, X, w_0)$ is a Nash algebraic function in (z, X), then there exists a holomorphic polynomial $P(z, X, t) = A_d(z, X)t^d + \cdots + A_0(z, X)$ of degree d in t, with $A_0(z, X) \not\equiv 0$ such that $P(z, X, \Phi(z, X, w_0)) \equiv 0$.

As $\Psi(z, g_1(z), \cdots, g_l(z), w) \equiv 0$ for $z \in U$, it follows that $\Phi(z, g_1(z), \cdots, g_l(z), w_0) \equiv 0$ and therefore $A_0(z, g_1(z), \cdots, g_l(z)) \equiv 0$. This means that $\{g_1(z), \cdots, g_l(z)\}$ are algebraic dependent over $\mathfrak{R}$. This is a contradiction.

Since $\Psi(z, X, w)$ is holomorphic in w and $\Psi(z, X, 0) \equiv 0$, then $\Psi(z, X, w) \equiv 0$. □

Now for any $(z, X, w) \in \hat{U} \times \text{conj}(U)$, we have the following functional identity:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{f}_i(z, X) \bar{f}_i(w) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \mu_j \log K_j(\cdots, X_\gamma, \cdots, \hat{g}_{j\alpha}(z, X), \cdots, \bar{g}_{j1}(w), \cdots, \bar{g}_{jm_j}(w)). \quad (9)$$

Lemma 2.4. *There exists $(z_0, w_0) \in U \times conj(U)$ such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{f}_i(z, X) \bar{f}_i(w) \not\equiv 0.$$

Proof. Assume not. Letting $w = \overline{z}$ and $X = (g_1(z), \cdots, g_l(z))$, it follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |f_i(z)|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{f}_i(z, g_1(z), \cdots, g_l(z)) \bar{f}_i(\overline{z}) \equiv 0, \text{ over } U.$$

This implies that $f_i(z) \equiv 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and therefore contradicts to the assumption that $F = (f_1, \cdots, f_n)$ is a non-constant map. □

Choosing z_0, w_0 as in Lemma 2.4, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{f}_i(z,X)\bar{f}_i(w)$ is a nonconstant holomorphic Nash algebraic function in X by Lemma 2.4 and by the fact that

$$K_j(\cdots, X_\gamma, \cdots, \hat{g}_{j\alpha}(z,X), \cdots, g_{j1}(w), \cdots, g_{jm_j}(w))$$

is also Nash algebraic in X for all j as the Bergman kernel function of bounded symmetric domain is rational. Hence we arrive at a contradiction by Lemma 2.1. Thus F must be a constant map. Now if all $\mu_j' s$ are further assumed to be positive, it is obvious that G must also be constant. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete.

3 Further remarks

A Hermitian symmetric space M of compact type can be holomorphically isometrically embedded into the complex projective space $\mathbb{P}^N$ by the Nakagawa-Takagi embedding. Notice that the Fubini-Study metric $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^N}$ on $\mathbb{P}^N$ in a standard holomorphic chart $\{w_1, \cdots, w_N\}$ is given by

$$\omega_{\mathbb{P}^N} = \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\log(1 + \sum_j |w_j|^2)$$

up to the normalizing constant, which is also of the form $\partial\bar{\partial}\log K(w,\bar{w})$, where $K(w,\bar{w})$ is an algebraic function. Therefore the same argument yields the following theorem:

Theorem 3.1. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a connected open subset. If there are holomorphic maps $F : D \to \mathbb{C}^n$ and $G = (G_1, \cdots, G_J) : D \to \Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_J$ and $L = (L_1, \cdots, L_K) : D \to \mathbb{P}^{N_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{P}^{N_K}$ such that*

$$F^*\omega_{\mathbb{C}^n} = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \mu_j G_j^* \omega_{\Omega_j} + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \lambda_k {L_k}^* \omega_{\mathbb{P}^{N_k}} \quad on \quad D$$

for real constants $\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_J, \lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_K$. Then F is a constant map. Moreover, if μ_j, λ_j are positive, G and L are also constant map.

Remark that the above constant $\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_J, \lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_K$ can be positive, negative or zero. In particular, Theorem 3.1 implies that the complex Euclidean space cannot be a relative to the product space of a bounded symmetric space and a Hermitian symmetric space of compact type. Note that, in [DL2], Di Scala and Loi showed that any bounded domain with Bergman metric and a Hermitian symmetric space of compact type cannot be relatives. Combining their results, we actually can conclude that any Hermitian symmetric space of a particular type and the product of Hermitian symmetric spaces of two other types cannot be relatives. More precisely, we summarize the result as follows:

Theorem 3.2. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a connected open set. Let $\Omega, M, \mathbb{C}^n$ be a Hermitian symmetric space of noncompact, compact and Euclidean type, respectively, equipped with the canonical*

metrics $\omega_\Omega, \omega_M, \omega_{\mathbb{C}^n}$. *If there exist non-constant holomorphic maps* $F : D \to \mathbb{C}^n$, $G : D \to \Omega$ *and* $L : D \to M$ *such that*

$$aF^*\omega_{\mathbb{C}^n} + bG^*\omega_\Omega + cL^*\omega_M = 0 \quad on \quad D$$

for real constants a, b, c, *then it must holds that* $a = b = c = 0$.

Next, we let $(D_1 \subset \mathbb{C}^n, \omega_1)$ and $(D_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^m, \omega_2)$ be two Kähler manifolds with $\omega_j = \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\log h_j(z, \bar{z})$. Here $h_j(z, \bar{z})$ are real analytic functions in z. Assume that $0 \in D_j$ and h_j $(j = 1, 2)$ do not have any non-constant harmonic terms in its Taylor expansion at the origin with $h_j(0, 0)$ being normalized to be 1. (D_1, ω_1) and (D_2, ω_2) are relative at 0 if and only if there are non-constant holomorphic maps $\phi_1 : \Delta \to D_1$ and $\phi_2 : \Delta \to D_2$ with $\phi_j(0) = 0$ such that $\phi_1^*(\omega_1) = \phi_2^*(\omega_2)$. Here Δ is the unit disk in $\mathbb{C}^1$. As standard, this happens if and only if

$$h_1(\phi_1(\tau), \overline{\phi_1(\tau)}) = h_2(\phi_2(\tau), \overline{\phi_2(\tau)}).$$

Now, we let the real analytic set $M \subset D_1 \times D_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+m}$ be defined by $h_1(z, \bar{z}) = h_2(w, \bar{w})$ with $(z, w) \in D_1 \times D_2$. By the fact that h_j serve as potential functions of Kähler metrics near 0, it is not hard to show that M must be regular at the origin. Then (D_1, ω_1) and (D_2, ω_2) are relative at 0 or near a point close to 0 if and only if inside M, there is a non-trivial holomorphic curve containing the origin. Then this cannot happen if and only if M is of D'Angelo finite type at 0 [DA]. Hence, by what we proved above, we have the following:

Theorem 3.3. *Let* $K_j(w, \bar{w})$ $(j = 1, \cdots, \kappa)$ *be postively-valued smooth Nash-algebraic functions in* $(w, \bar{w})$ *with* $w(\in \mathbb{C}^m) \approx 0$. *Assume that the complex Hessian of* $\log K_j(w, \bar{w})$ *is positive definite for each* j. *Then for any positive real numbers* $\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_\kappa$, *the following real-analytic hypersurface* M *defined near the origin is of finite D'Angelo type at* 0*:*

$$M := \{(z, w)(\subset \mathbb{C}^{n+m}) \approx (0, 0) : \quad \sum_{j=1}^{n} |z_j|^2 = \sum_{l=1}^{\kappa} \mu_l \log K_l(w, \bar{w})\}.$$

References

[C] Calabi, E.: *Isometric imbedding of complex manifolds*, Ann. of Math. (2) 58, (1953). 1–23.

[CU] Clozel, L. and Ullmo, E.: *Correspondances modulaires et mesures invariantes*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 558 (2003), 47–83.

[DA] D'Angelo, J., Real hypersurfaces, orders of contact, and applications, Ann. Math., 115 (1982), 615-637.

[DIL] Di Scala, A.; Ishi, H. and Loi, A.: *Kähler immersions of homogeneous Kähler manifolds into complex space forms*, Asian J. Math. 16 (2012), no. 3, 479-487.

[DL1] Di Scala, A. and Loi, A.: *Kähler maps of Hermitian symmetric spaces into complex space forms,* Geom. Dedicata 125 (2007), 103-113.

[DL2] Di Scala, A. and Loi, A.: *Kähler manifolds and their relatives,* Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) 9 (2010), no. 3, 495-501.

[FK] Faraut, J. and Koŕanyi, A.: *Function spaces and reproducing kernels on bounded symmetric domains,* J. Funct. Anal. 88 (1990), 64-89.

[Hu1] Huang, X.: *On the mapping problem for algebraic real hypersurfaces in the complex spaces of different dimensions*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **44** (1994), no. 2, 433–463.

[Hu2] Huang, X.: *Schwarz reflection principle in complex spaces of dimension two,* Comm. Partial Differential Equations 21 (1996), no. 11-12, 1781-1828.

[HY] Huang, X. and Yuan, Y.: *Holomorphic isometry from a Kähler manifold into a product of complex projective manifolds*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 24 (2014), no. 3, 854-886.

[Ji] Ji, S.: *Algebraicity of real analytic hypersurfaces with maximal rank,* Amer. J. Math. 124 (2002), no. 6, 1083-1102.

[Mo1] Mok, N.: Metric Rigidity Theorems on Hermitian Locally Symmetric Manifolds, Series in Pure Mathematics. 6. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., Teaneck, NJ, 1989. xiv+278 pp..

[Mo2] Mok, N.: *Geometry of holomorphic isometries and related maps between bounded domains*, Geometry and analysis. No. 2, 225-270, Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM) 18, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2011.

[Mo3] Mok, N.: *Extension of germs of holomorphic isometries up to normalizing constants with respect to the Bergman metric*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. 14 (2012), no. 5, 1617-1656.

[MN] Mok, N. and Ng, S.: *Germs of measure-preserving holomorphic maps from bounded symmetric domains to their Cartesian products*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 669 (2012), 47-73.

[Ng] Ng, S.: *Holomorphic Double Fibration and the Mapping Problems of Classical Domains,* to appear in Int. Math. Res. Not.

[U] Umehara, M.: *Kaehler submanifolds of complex space forms,* Tokyo J. Math. 10 (1987), no. 1, 203-214.

[YZ] Yuan, Y. and Zhang, Y.: *Rigidity for local holomorphic isometric embeddings from B^n into $B^{N_1} \times ... \times B^{N_m}$ up to conformal factors*, J. Differential Geom. 90 (2012), no. 2, 329-349.

Xiaojun Huang, huangx@math.rutgers.edu, Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08854 USA.

Yuan Yuan, yyuan05@syr.edu, Department of Mathematics, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244 USA.